



Towards a Frictionless Architecture of Hybrid Work Ecosystem: A Multidimensional Narrative Amalgamation of Spatial, Technological, Strategic and Experiential Transitions

Pushpa Prajapati^{1,2}, Dr. Shweta Bhatia³

¹Research Scholar, Faculty of Management Studies, Jagannath University, Jaipur, India.

²Assistant Professor, Gitarattan International Business School, Affiliated to Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi, India.

³Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, Jagannath University, Jaipur, India

Abstract – Transitions in spatial, technological, organisational strategies and employer-employee experiences have disintegrated the organisational systems post pandemic. This narrative review synthesises extant literature to highlight frictions caused by the factors of hybrid work flexibility and focuses on building a fluid hybrid work ecosystem that can overcome the headless chicken zig-zag shuttling and firefighting instincts. A narrative review approach was necessary to capture radically fragmented and diversified nuances of hybrid work and provide a single integrated seamless architecture of a hybrid work ecosystem, not synthesised previously. This narrative review was based on wide verifiable reference base as against a narrow exhaustive literature through replicable search protocol or formal quality appraisal. Targeted searches identified peer-reviewed journals and practitioner gray literature published between 2019 to 2026 reporting accelerated implementation and adoption of hybrid work. A prominent indication of the review is that hybrid work frictions originate from multidimensional causes. Resource allocation and availability at multi-locations, technological gaps, unclear policies and psychological burdens compound and produce a cumulative friction on both the employer and the employee and when addressed in isolation fails to provide flawless hybrid work ecosystem. These findings do corroborate with gray literature reports on practitioner scale. The findings are highly illustrative and provide a conceptual thematisation which should not be treated as an evidence map but used as a precursory guide for future systematic and empirical studies. This study is the first of its kind to integrate the fragmented and diverging aspects of various hybrid work frictions, proposing an integrated hybrid work ecosystem that balances boundary spanning, technology, organisational reforms and psychological obstructions that informs sustainable organisational designs and future interdisciplinary research.

Keywords - Hybrid work, Ecosystem, Flexibility, Friction, Strategies, Employee experience, Narrative

I. INTRODUCTION

Catching momentum as a contingent arrangement to cope with the pandemic restrictions, hybrid work has gradually realised an unparalleled modern work structure (Teng-Calleja et al., 2024). Hybrid work may be characterised as a continuous but repetitive transition amid traditional and non-traditional work environments, location where work is done and temporal patterns governing when work is done (Lauring & Jonasson, 2025). But every change comes with interventions and so is hybrid work. Employees and many a times employers as well have been apparently unfolding some patterns of recurring but specific frictions that limits sustainability in hybrid work environment. There still exists a gap between the constant flexibility offered in hybrid work and the real-time constant friction experiences of many organisations and their employees asking for seamless changeovers.

Hybrid work flexibility repeatedly involves re-orienting oneself to changing workspace, time and ergonomics, re-establishing access to various resources and psychological preparation. This flexibility causes friction that cannot be attributed to one single cause. It is a cumulative amalgamation of four interrelated and interdependent elements of the hybrid work ecosystem, (1) multi-

workspace designs, wherein an employee has to adapt according to the workstation design, ergonomics and the resources available (2) technological variations that multiplies tasks across those spaces (3) organisational hybrid work policies that govern employee-manager proximity and deviates preference for appraisal and promotion and (4) the employer-employee experience causing psychological disturbances that impacts intent to hybrid work itself. These may create various other volatile spaces as can be seen in the narrative.

Academic evidences are available for activity-based workplace (ABW) designs (Candido et al., 2019; Oygür et al., 2022; Vartiainen & Vanharanta, 2024), virtual or digital employee experiences (Moganadas & Goh, 2022), stringent return-to-office policies of organisations (Ding & Ma, 2024), and managing blurred boundary between work and home (Perrigino & Raveendhran, 2020). Existing literature has examined these factors largely as separate context of hybrid work, thus, failing to critically examine and synthesise them under a single framework simultaneously. The hybrid work model of Vartiainen and Vanharanta (2024) has rudimentarily reported four basic spaces in hybrid work taking a systems view of flexibility. Similarly, Lauring & Jonasson (2025) have identified three dimensions of hybrid work and presented a fundamental



conceptual framework. Both these models integrate the elements of hybrid work to establish flexibility. However, integration for flexibility is not the solution but the focus should be on how to make this flexibility flawless. This study intends to address this specific gap by integrating four underlying streams around two research questions:

(a) What are the various frictions caused across multi-workplace designs, technological variations, organisational policies and psychological experiences in hybrid work setup?

(b) What does the extant literature suggest to reduce frictions arising from multidimensional factors and create a frictionless flexibility architecture of hybrid work ecosystem?

II. NARRATIVE REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The present paper used a narrative review approach to analyse and identify the broad problems of hybrid work, appropriate to integrate the fragmented concepts across incongruent extant literatures rather than using systematic review for exhaustive enumeration of academic articles or synthesising upon meta-analytics based on narrowly constrained empirical research questions (Grant & Booth, 2009; Teng-Calleja et al., 2024; Huusko et al., 2026). Systematic review is well suited for precise and focussed research questions by summarizing metadata. Narrative review, on the other hand, addresses broad but interpretative research questions which focuses on the deep understanding of the area under study (Greenhalgh et al., 2018).

To identify literature, structured searches were done on Google Scholar for scholarly articles and Google Search for gray literature using hybrid work and its related four layer terms (Example: “telepressure”, “remote work”, “return-to-office mandates”, “work-life” “boundary management”, “digital employee experience”, “activity based office”, “hot desking”). Scholarly articles from peer-reviewed journals published from 2019 to 2026 were given priority. There was deliberate inclusion of gray literature based on large sample consultancy, industry and relevant professional bodies including Microsoft Worklab, McKinsey & Company, Deloitte, Gensler, Gallup, CIPD and PwC reports and articles published recently since 2021. Finally, 33 peer-reviewed sources and 8 gray literature sources were included in the synthesis.

The gray literature of recency, though not peer-reviewed and verified, still provided findings at practitioner scale applied to real-time current organisational practices, which was used as supplementary evidences backed with large sample sizes ranging from 10,000 to over 1,80,000 respondents, substantiate the themes from academic papers and highlight scholarly gaps. To maintain validity and integrity, sources of gray literature accessible from identifiable organisational ownership or attributable

authorship with date were included so that publicly available reports can be easily verified. Saturation point was considered when additional search queries resulted in substantial redundant citations or core theoretical framework and ceased to surface new themes given the conceptual scope of the review rather than exhaustive.

The Scale of the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles (SANRA) guided in maintaining methodological transparency (Baethge et al., 2019). In introduction section, it informed defining the aims explicitly, then search for literature and finally present balanced converging-diverging thematic evidence.

III. RESULTS

1. The Concept of Hybrid Work Friction

According to Lauring and Jonasson (2025), hybrid work is not a fixed ratio of work days at office or home or elsewhere but a flexible and continuous transition across three magnitudes namely, modality (mode of communication is face-to-face or virtual), location (home, office, any remote third place) and temporality (covering the frequency and duration of time work is done). Similarly, Vartiainen and Vanharanta (2024) have highlighted four such components of hybrid work consisting of the physical space, the virtual space, the temporal space and the social space that interact to produce flexibility. However, the main cause of friction is not the mere existence of hybrid work flexibility. It is fundamentally the transition that occurs dynamically across multiple dimensions and in doing so it is the switching experience quality that defines the friction, the actual unit of analysis.

In the diary-based review of hybrid workers, Huusko et al. (2026) analysed how work was organised and experienced over the temporal dimension defining schedules, work routines and meetings due to constant recalibration between office and remote. Employees adjusted themselves to the continuous change in working modes which in turn accelerated a sense of increased work pace and feeling of ‘busyness’, a central characteristic of employees’ lived experience.

A hybrid work infrastructure problem is not about accessible tools at remote location or flexible work policies but the element of easy switching incorporated in the organisational hybrid work support systems such as scheduling systems, processes, access to data and information, communication channels and management practices. Ideally, this support system if readily available can make transition smooth and effortless else it burdens the employees with extra work load both mentally and physically. The employees need to carry equipments and tools, synchronising schedules of work and home with calendars and ensuring access to substantive resources themselves (Huusko et al., 2026). So, the friction lies in



the quality of transition rather than the quantity of transition across space, time, tools and people.

2. The Multi-workspace Mobility Redesigning

The workplace design required in hybrid work is a recurring theme where it has been noticed that offices are designed for each employee individually and normally fixed. This arrangement poorly matches with the hybrid work attendance patterns. After working in home ambience for a long time, employees have become prone to naturally open, arid, well-lit green workspaces.

Recent studies have shown that employees are expecting workplaces to give more preference to health, psychological well-being and sustainability rather than basic functional amenities. Contemporary office goes value workplace features that have greenery, abundance of natural light, thermal comfort, suitable indoor air quality and finally some comfortable ergonomic designs as these components significantly influence positive health and well-being apart from job satisfaction. Systematic evidence-based studies indicate that health-conscious office ambience improves productivity at work along with job satisfaction. Alternatively, green-certified-buildings oriented studies suggests higher employee satisfaction due to good indoor ambience and ergonomics reporting fewer symptoms of health disorders. (Lee et al., 2019; Colenberg et al., 2020).

Similarly, hot desking is a kind of non-territorial work arrangement wherein the occupant has no assigned permanent desks. Instead, they can enter the premises and occupy the available workstations on a first-come-first serve basis thus supporting flexibility. However, this arrangement is still not free from friction as it carries uncertainty, reduced workspace control and continuity due to continuous switching (Adikesavan & Ramasubramanian, 2023; Deloitte, 2025).

Another alternative is the prevalence of ABW in which workstations are assigned for the tasks being performed. The employees are required to occupy the workstation based on the tasks rather than permanent desks to perform all tasks (Oygür et al., 2022). This design response is dominating modern spaces showing higher associated work satisfaction and productivity. Here different types of activity-based settings matched with type of tasks being performed by employees. However, this arrangement was highly dependent on the noise quality of the workspaces and also whether the settings supported quiet concentration zones and collaborative ones distinctly (Candido et al., 2019).

An empirical cross-sectional study by Tulenheimo-Eklund et al. (2025), covering 971 employees from five organisations from Finland, provided evidence that the quality perception of ABW was related to employee well-being and the ability of hybrid workers to adapt to such settings. However, studies covering office design have

failed to parallelly take an account for remote work settings on the same platform.

On the contrary, hybrid workspace should treat the office and home workstation functional settings as a single unit of analysis as they both being two separate environments are interdependent and amalgamate together into the hybrid work framework. (Holman et al., 2026). However, this is a complementary assumption presuming that home workspace is adequately furnished with relevant equipments and tools. About 42.2 per cent remote workers had to modify their homes to accommodate work and adapt physically in smaller or rented houses with families facing constraints of their own kind. This is a significant consideration while creating a frictionless hybrid work ecosystem framework. The physical layer in hybrid work cannot be considered solely as an organisational workplace design problem, but it requires an integration of both office as well as home workspaces with equal allocation and access across employees (Cuerdo-Vilches et al., 2021). According to Holman et al. (2026), the recovery-supportive office feature may enhance task performance while its interaction-supportive feature may enhance workspace fulfilment. Similarly, the concentration-supportive home ambience may increase employee engagement and innovation. Thus, a fluid hybrid work physical layer should deliberately consider both home and office design complementary to each other rather than organisations investing solely on office-based infrastructure or remote workspace compromise.

3. Technological Variations Layer and Continuity to Tools, Access and Cybersecurity

Technology should not be taken as a static background enabler of hybrid work but as an ever-evolving dynamic element that shapes communication, information sharing and collaboration among employees and creates an experience of satisfaction, engagement and increased productivity. Human ability to work with technology is mutually shaped over time (John & Panteli, 2024).

Normally, employees are required to follow the physical workspace where work is actually performed. On the contrary, the variations incurred in the technological layer in the form of data, work requirement, communication, information sharing, collaboration and cybersecurity actually follows the employees wherever they work from and this creates digital employee experience (DEX), central theme to this review as it is the core to successful hybrid work arrangements. DEX is not about access to and usage ability of technology but beyond. It is the cumulative employee experience while working with digital tools and infrastructure from fragmented workspaces. Effective DEX can be ensured by integrating technology and digital systems with all the organisational operations, digital literacy training, cybersecurity concerns, technological support in remote mode and streamlining technostress in employees. (Moganadas & Goh, 2022; Swati et al., 2025).



Apart from addressing employee experience in “digital embeddedness” (John & Panteli, 2024), a more critical concern across remote-office switching is ensuring continued communication and collaboration covering complete temporal elements of all employees undertaking a project or task. The easier the use of technology, the easier it becomes to communicate, share information and seek advice and support from organisational members (Wu et al., 2023). But the drawback remains in the visibility of an employee to managers and peers in hybrid work setups where communication maybe mediated reducing the potential for promotions in comparison to co-employees in physical office proximity (Cristea & Leonardi, 2019; Mortensen & Haas, 2021 as cited by Wu et al., 2023).

Another reported concern of technological variations in hybrid work is security and privacy of employee and organisational data and information. Security threats may arise due to digital literacy gaps where an employee is unaware of safe technological use, insufficient employee training by organisations and the increased use of personal digital tools and networks in an insecure remote workspace. Privacy is hit by the sophisticated surveillance technologies deployed by employers to monitor and control employees and their performance (Nurse et al., 2021; Grobler, 2024). When employees are required to transition from one work location to another, traditional security tools become obsolete and this prompts a zero-trust digital infrastructure. Cybersecurity is maintained through continuous identity verification logins and device validation prompts regardless of the location of the employee (Itodo & Ozer, 2024). According to Nurse et al. (2021), this zero-trust authentication prompts may result into fatigue and frustration among employees.

4. The Organisational Hybrid Work Policies Layer and Transparency

One of the most challenged dimensions in the hybrid work ecosystem is organisational policies governing remote and in-office employees in hybrid work setup. The pandemic had created a sense of flexibility, reduced or no commute time, autonomy and provisions for work-life balance among remote workers. However, organisations found that remote work did not provide the culture prevalent in physical settings lacking communication, collaboration and ultimately innovation (Gibson et al., 2023; Williamson et al., 2024). This is evident from the proliferation of return-to-office (RTO) or back-to-office mandates, thus, incorporating rigidity against flexibility.

Policies rigid on in-office presence of employees is overlooking employee preference for work location. Rather than establishing traditional pre-pandemic office norms, organisations should cross-check whether physical presence is to actually add value and sustainability in the long term. Organisations should focus on negotiating remote and in-office presence with employee and create balance rather than mandates (Gibson et al., 2023; Williamson et al., 2024). The reports of S&P 500

companies by Ding & Ma (2024) clearly ratified that managers did not want to lose control on employees so that performance is maintained. However, RTO mandates showed a fall in job satisfaction with no signs of financial growth for firms.

Similarly, a significant impact on the turnover rate of employees at senior levels was eminent due to RTO mandates as reported by Van Dijke et al. (2024). According to the authors, there has been an abnormal attrition of employees from firms mandating RTO and joining hands with competitors without RTO mandates. According to a report by Hankamer School of Business (2025) about 13 to 14 per cent high-performers at various levels left their organisations in the IT and Finance sectors. Under the public domain of U.S Federal RTO mandate in 2025, it was reported that employees experienced a reverse difficult transition from the pandemic driven easier remote work transition. While remote work increased flexibility and autonomy, RTO resulted in some level of spatial autonomy withdrawal while digital work remained intense as before. Due to inconsistent psychological contract and decreased trust in management there was no reported enhancement in productivity (Morin et al., 2026). The RTO mandates have neither been positive in terms of productivity nor negative in terms of flexibility but still remain a matter of friction among hybrid work employees. Further, friction in hybrid work may be attributed to lack of hybrid work policies communication by managers to employees (Waizenegger et al., 2020). When organisational hybrid work policies are not communicated with transparency, this results in uncertainty which negatively impacts trust and confidence of employees in their manager’s decision (Kniffin et al., 2021; Gibson et al., 2023). It has also been reported by Williamson et al. (2024) that inconsistent implementation of hybrid work policies, differently and unequally, among individuals and teams create confusion and imbibe a feeling of inequality.

5. The Employer-employee Experience Layer and Psychological Resilience

Finally, the experience layer is all about the inner cognitive and psychological integration that can diligently segregate the hybrid work ecosystem and define its boundary. This can be understood with the boundary management theory proposed by Ashforth et al. (2000). Individuals either prefer segmentation of roles or integration of roles to maintain a limitation between work and family lives. It is the quality of selective permeability and the fluidity of these boundaries that impacts how flexibly individuals transition across these boundaries to balance work-life in various contexts of hybrid work.

According to the assess-create-support conceptual framework, organisations and employees establish and balance both psychological as well as temporal limitations between home-office boundary. It is not the context of being in remote work or hybrid that generates negative health implications but it is the insufficient capability to



define the boundary and sustain in its limits (Perrigino & Raveendhran, 2020). Further, there is empirical evidence that employees who were capable of drawing temporal boundaries, where they knew when to start and when to stop, successfully detached from work mentally and had control of their non-working hours. Alternatively, those who failed to control their working hours faced exhaustion. These effects were studied in the presence of two moderators like individual segmentation preferences (separating roles from each other) and situational availability demands (Haun et al., 2022).

Next, workplace telepressure is another dominant construct. Telepressure is a form of reduced ability to psychologically detach from work operations, that reinforces an individual to have a feeling of urgency to respond quickly to all work-related directives, overstepping the time and location boundaries skipping leisure which significantly leads to sleep disorders, impaired recovery and exhaustion (Cambier & Vlerick, 2022; Barber et al., 2026). Workplace telepressure along with technostress negatively impacts well-being of employees. Technostress can be inhibited with effective technical support and training along with a transparent hybrid work policy communication (Pfaffinger et al., 2022).

The always available mode of work sustains telepressure and allows locational and temporal flexibility. This can create a psychological friction against fluid hybrid work ecosystem. It was seen that technological integration with location and time can reduce logistical frictions, however, this same technology can impair the psychological well-being and productivity. Hence, technology should be integrated with the hybrid work framework that deliberately supports boundary management designs and norms.

This layer is further weakened by age and individual differences pertaining in an organisation and complicates the integration of various layers with a single perspective. Since one-size-does-not-fit-all, individual factors should also be taken into consideration and there should always lie a scope for seamless flexibility in the existing hybrid work ecosystem for individual preferences and capabilities. According to Scheibe and Schmitt (2024), home-office boundary spanning or productivity efficiency differed across ages and organisations cannot expect uniform psychological responses to a single hybrid work model. In accordance with the ecological systems theory of Bronfenbrenner, it was observed that organisations that avail adequate tools with supportive transparent policies while taking engagement initiatives on their shoulder make employees perceive the environment accommodating while laggard technology in the midst of enforced disciplinary policies are dynamically destructive. (Teng-Calleja et al., 2024).

Similarly, a survey of 412 individuals in hybrid work suggested hybrid work can either act as a job resource in terms of autonomy and control, flexibility and work-life balance, or take the guise of job demand challenges like isolation, technostress, unequal workload, unclear expectations and coordination issues. Individual experiences influenced by the above two circumstances may vary and create a positive or negative hybrid work perception. Psychological outcomes always cannot be a product of hybrid work setup but also depends on the surrounding organisational context that adopts hybrid work (Dale et al., 2024).

6. Evidences from Professional Industry and Consultancy Literature

A Global Workplace Survey across 15 countries by Gensler Research Institute (2025) based on a sample size of 16,809 office workers reported that against a need for 65% office week to be effective only 55% of the week was spent in office by employees. Employees when granted the freedom to choose from different work settings were almost three times more likely to stay with the current employer. This survey empirically consisting of a large sample size, supports the activity-based work design, suggested by Candido et al. (2019) and Holman et al. (2026) on the physical layer.

On the technological front, a survey was conducted by PwC (2023) to interpret global digital trust among employees with a sample size of over 3,500 from above 60 territories. Less than 40 per cent of IT, security and business leaders agreed that cybersecurity risks in remote or hybrid work cannot be completely alleviated in spite of high-tech security investment. This evidence has been academically corroborated with the findings of Itodo and Ozer (2024).

Additional evidence that complements this argument has been provided by an analysis conducted by Microsoft WorkLab's (2025) with a sample size of 20,000 participants along with trillions of productivity activity patterns identified using Microsoft 365 application providing behavioural insights. The reports highlighted that managers in hybrid mode markedly showed lower trust in employees due to lack of awareness and visibility compared to managers working in close proximity with their team. Since the pandemic there was an irreversible increase by 153 per cent in weekly Teams digital meetings indicating an increase in technological dependency for connectivity among scattered workers which cannot be substituted with spontaneous informal interactions and observations as in physical co-existence. The survey revealed the hybrid work paradox of how, on one end, digital technologies support uninterrupted communication and collaboration while, on the other end, it deteriorates managers trust in employees working apart and missing visible behavioural cues.



On the policy layer, McKinsey, CIPD and SHRM have reported consistent flexibility patterns. Since 2022 there has been a significant drop in fully remote U.S workforce, just a few years post-pandemic as reported by McKinsey (2025)'s American Opportunity Survey. Job seekers still prefer flexible or hybrid setups as one of the top three job qualities while evaluating employment opportunities. Likewise, CIPD (2025) presented their survey reports based on UK employers and employees. About 65 per cent of organisations that permitted hybrid work mandated some fixed in-office workdays. However, 30 per cent of employees requested flexible work setups formally as they felt uncomfortable with fixed office days. The mere existence of formal flexibility policies diverges from the employees' perception to use such entitlements. Still, organisational culture and practices critically determine hybrid work deliverables. SHRM (2025) also conforms with the fact that more than seven U.S. workers out of ten would prefer to stay back with their employer if given the provisions of fully remote or hybrid work flexibility. Similar peer-reviewed scholarly findings have been identified in the works of Van Dijcke et al. (2024) along with Ding and Ma (2024).

Finally, a report published by Gallup (2024) on State of Global Workspace from a sample size of over 1,28,000 from 160 countries stated that loneliness was experienced by every one in five employees over the world, particularly remote workers proportionately being on the higher node. Also, a dip has been noted in the engagement level of employees alongside declining well-being among employees falling under 35 age group. Psychological telepressure and telestress due to blurred boundary limitations do impact mental-health and well-being as stated in the scholarly articles of Barber and Santuzzi (2015) and Haun et al. (2022) has been proved on global-scale by Gallup (2024). Hence, remote work has the tendency to increase loneliness which may be due to social isolation.

From this corroboration it can be stated that these practitioner evidences on large-scale backed with modern statistical evaluations does not degrade the findings of peer-reviewed scholarly literature; rather, these current practically action-oriented perspectives conform with the theoretical literature, giving additional weightage to this synthesis.

IV. FLUID HYBRID WORK ECOSYSTEM CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of fluid hybrid work ecosystem emerged iteratively from the above synthesis, while enhancing consistency and transparency and presented in Figure 1.

V. DISCUSSION

1. Towards a Fluid Hybrid Work Ecosystem

From the synthesis, it is evident that hybrid work flexibility is not a product of just location, time, technology and employee presence. It is the quality in how various factors of hybrid work diffuse into and across each other creating a gradient fusion just like the blending of colours. An activity-based office space, hotdesking facility or the best of ambience at office buildings if not available in remote work hinders the physical space flexibility (Cuerdo-Vilches et al., 2021). Similarly, if companies are adamant on in-office mandates then the best of technology (Itodo & Ozer, 2024) may be underutilised showing virtual space and institutional space friction. Technopressure, cyber threats and privacy issues create temporal, cognitive and psychological space friction. Scattered workforce and communication gaps create the social, psychological and coordination space friction. The visibility and proximity issues of employee experience create identification space friction. A deterred, unequal and untransparent hybrid work policy may lead to poor employee experience (Teng-Calleja et al., 2024; Morin et al., 2026).

Subsequently, hybrid work can be defined as a frictionless flexible integrated ecosystem made up of various spaces that blends and diffuses among each other to create fluid movement but cannot be optimised individually.

2. Practical Implications

This study intends to move from a successful hybrid work model to a seamless integrated architecture of hybrid work ecosystem (See Figure 1).

Organisations should refrain from treating hybrid work as a single flexibility issue and consider the entire ecosystem under one umbrella (Holman et al., 2026) while technology should enhance employee experience and should not be a mere transition communication support system (Moganadas & Goh, 2022), or a zero-trust authentication bot (Itodo & Ozer, 2024). Similarly, policies should trust employee participation and preferences rather than unilateral mandates but with precision and control (Morin et al., 2026; Ding & Ma, 2024). Finally, organisation should support boundary management with proper trainings as employee may not be able to develop their own tactics (Perrigino & Raveendhran, 2020). The new ecosystem would be required to reduce hierarchy, making flow of information and decisions free from barrier.

The best solution to the frictions created by constant switching of workspaces is to have desk reservation systems, employee's personal lockers to store their belongings so that they do not need to carry them wherever they go along with supportive arrangements bridging the home-office setups. This can create a sense of belonging in employees and ultimately improve productivity and ensure employee well-being (Adikesavan and Ramasubramanian,



2023). Cybersecurity meant for safer mobility and surveillance systems for enhancing support and productivity may end up in technostress and privacy concerns. A hybrid work ecosystem should combine the concerns of surveillance, cybersecurity, privacy and ethical issues and employee-technology frictions altogether to create resilience.

Organisations need to create a transparent hybrid work communication system with consistent policy implementation across all levels that can facilitate two-way manager-employee interactions thus reducing uncertainty while increasing trust (Waizenegger et al., 2020; Williamson et al., 2024).

Organisations should focus on effective leadership, relevant technology, clear and transparent communication and take employee well-being initiatives so that hybrid work becomes a resource and not a stress. Organisations are not only required to focus on the physical and technological aspects of hybrid work but develop strategies to create an environment to connect the social beings on tasks.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The gray literature from professional practices entrenches the facts from academic literature that organisations have been struggling with the hybrid work phenomenon and they need renaissance beyond traditional human resource challenges by developing a mastermind framework as in Figure 1. We know many things but we need to convert all of them into one big thing.

A few limitations lie in the fact that though the literature referred are genuine and from verifiable sources, backed with SANRA (Baethge et al., 2019) for reporting quality, still it lacks the empirical background without metadata and replicability. A systematic review may surface restricted and contradictory foresights on a narrow scale. Secondly, major literature has covered European, Northern America and some zones in Australia or Southeast Asian settings, hence the findings are not generalizable. Future research designs should focus on longitudinal, empirical tests taking the conceptual framework presented in this review.

REFERENCES

1. Adikesavan, M. A., & Ramasubramanian, L. (2023). Facilitating hotdesking in a hybrid campus environment: Lessons from the hotdesking experiences of doctoral students in a U.S. public university. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 25(2), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRE-12-2021-0047>
2. Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259305>
3. Baethge, C., Goldbeck-Wood, S., & Mertens, S. (2019). SANRA—a scale for the quality assessment of narrative review articles. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 4, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8>
4. Barber, L. K., Santuzzi, A. M., & Hu, X. (2026). Tackling the problem of workplace telepressure: Are disconnection policies helpful? *Group & Organization Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011231206206>
5. Cambier, R., & Vlerick, P. (2022). When thoughts have no off switch: The cost of telepressure and message-based communication behaviour within boundary-crossing contexts. *Occupational Health Science*, 6(4), 545–564. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-022-00127-7>
6. Candido, C., Thomas, L., Haddad, S., Zhang, F., Mackey, M., & Ye, W. (2019). Designing activity-based workspaces: Satisfaction, productivity and physical activity. *Building Research & Information*, 47(3), 275–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2018.1476372>
7. CIPD (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development). (2025). Flexible and hybrid working practices in 2025. <https://www.cipd.org/en/knowledge/reports/flexible-hybrid-working/>
8. Colenberg, S., Jylhä, T., & Arkesteijn, M. (2020). The relationship between interior office space and employee health and well-being: A literature review. *Building Research & Information*, 49(3), 352–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2019.1710098>
9. Cuerdo-Vilches, T., Navas-Martín, M. Á., & Oteiza, I. (2021). Working from home: Is our housing ready? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(14), 7329. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18147329>
10. Dale, G., Wilson, H., & Tucker, M. (2024). What is healthy hybrid work? Exploring employee perceptions on well-being and hybrid work arrangements. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 17(4), 335–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-03-2024-0041>
11. Deloitte. (2025). Rethinking the workplace: Hybrid work in the future of work. Deloitte. https://www.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/de/Documents/human-capital/Deloitte_Rethinking%20the%20workplace%20Hybrid%20work%20in%20the%20future%20of%20work.pdf
12. Ding, Y., & Ma, M. (2024). Return-to-office mandates. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4675401
13. Gallup, Inc. (2024). State of the global workplace: 2024 report. <https://www.ahtd.org/files/state-of-the-global-workplace-2024-key-insights.pdf>
14. Gensler Research Institute. (2025). Global workplace survey 2025. Gensler.



- <https://www.gensler.com/gri/global-workplace-survey-2025>
15. Gibson, C. B., Gilson, L. L., Griffith, T. A., & O'Neill, T. A. (2023). Should employees be required to return to the office? *Organizational Dynamics*, 52(2), Article 100981. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100981>
 16. Grobler, M. (2024). Cybersecurity when working from home during COVID-19: Considering the human factors. *Journal of Cybersecurity*, 10(1), tyae001. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cybsec/tyae001>
 17. Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
 18. Greenhalgh, T., Thorne, S., & Malterud, K. (2018). Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews? *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 48(6), e12931. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eci.12931>
 19. Hankamer School of Business, Baylor University. (2025). Return-to-office mandates and the hidden cost of brain drain. <https://hankamer.baylor.edu/news/story/2025/return-office-mandates-and-hidden-cost-brain-drain>
 20. Haun, V. C., Rimmel, C., & Haun, S. (2022). Boundary management and recovery when working from home: The moderating roles of segmentation preference and availability demands. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221079048>
 21. Holman, D., Davis, M., Escaffi-Schwarz, M., & Ono, M. (2026). The hybrid workspace: Testing an activity-based model of hybrid workspace design. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2026.2648294>
 22. Huusko, A., Kuismin, A., & Sivunen, A. (2026). The business is all about busyness: Hybrid workers' temporal autonomy and the temporal structure of acceleration. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 21(5), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-06-2025-3054>
 23. Itodo, C., & Ozer, M. (2024). Multivocal literature review on zero-trust security implementation. *Computers & Security*, 141, 103827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2024.103827>
 24. John, B., & Panteli, N. (2024). Reconfiguring digital embeddedness in hybrid work: The case of employee experience management platforms. *Information Systems Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12545>
 25. Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Keesbir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., ... Vugt, M. V. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716>
 26. Laurant, J., & Jonasson, C. (2025). What is hybrid work? Towards greater conceptual clarity of a common term and understanding its consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 35(1), 101044. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.101044>
 27. Lee, J.-Y., Wargocki, P., Chan, Y.-H., Chen, L., & Tham, K.-W. (2019). Indoor environmental quality, occupant satisfaction, and acute building-related health symptoms in Green Mark-certified compared with non-certified office buildings. *Indoor Air*, 29(1), 112–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12515>
 28. McKinsey & Company. (2025). Flexible work's enduring appeal affects workers, employers, and real estate. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/real-estate/our-insights/flexible-works-enduring-appeal-affects-workers-employers-and-real-estate>
 29. Microsoft WorkLab. (2025). Hybrid work is just work. Are we doing it wrong? <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/worklab/work-trend-index/hybrid-work-is-just-work>
 30. Moganadas, S. R., & Goh, G. G. G. (2022). Digital employee experience constructs and measurement framework: A review and synthesis. *International Journal of Technology*, 13(5), 999–1012.
 31. Morin, G., Doberstein, C., & Charbonneau, É. (2026). Mandated return-to-office policies and federal employee well-being: Evidence from three waves of U.S. survey data. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260261444414>
 32. Nurse, J. R. C., Williams, N., Collins, E., Panteli, N., Blythe, J., & Koppelman, B. (2021). Remote working pre- and post-COVID-19: An analysis of new threats and risks to security and privacy. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Information Management and Computer Security*.
 33. Oygür, I., Ergöz Karahan, E., & Göçer, Ö. (2022). Hybrid workplace: Activity-based office design in a post-pandemic era. *Journal of Interior Design*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joid.12218>
 34. Pfaffinger, K. F., Reif, J. A. M., & Spieß, E. (2022). When and why telepressure and technostress creators impair employee well-being. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 28(2), 958–973. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2020.1846376>
 35. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
 36. Perrigino, M. B., & Raveendhran, R. (2020). Managing remote workers during quarantine: Insights from organizational research on boundary management. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/237946152000600211>



37. PwC (PricewaterhouseCoopers). (2023). Global digital trust insights survey. <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/news-room/press-releases/2022/global-digital-trust-insights-survey.html>
38. Scheibe, S., & Schmitt, A. (2024). Age-related differences in the use of boundary management tactics when teleworking: Implications for productivity and work-life balance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12512>
39. SHRM (Society for Human Resource Management). (2025). Insight-backed flexibility: Why return-to-office mandates falter. <https://www.shrm.org/enterprise-solutions/insights/flexibility-why-return-to-office-mandates-falter>
40. Swathi, M., Jeevitha, C., & Bharath, M. (2025). DEX – Digital Employee Experience at Digital Workplace: Challenges and strategic implications for organization practicality. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 15(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15617522>
41. Teng-Calleja, M., Mactal, M. T. D. G., & Caringal-Go, J. F. (2024). Examining employee experiences of hybrid work: An ecological approach. *Personnel Review*, 53(6), 1408–1424. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2023-0222>
42. Tulenheimo-Eklund, E., Haapakangas, A., Hirvonen, M., Ruohomäki, V., & Reijula, K. (2025). Perceptions of activity-based offices are associated with employee well-being and self-reported work ability in hybrid work: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 67(1), uiaf027. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joccuh/uiaf027>
43. Van Dijcke, D., Gunsilius, F., & Wright, D. (2024). Return to office and the tenure distribution. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2405.04352>
44. Vartiainen, M., & Vanharanta, O. (2024). True nature of hybrid work. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, 2, Article 1448894. <https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2024.1448894>
45. Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>
46. Williamson, S., Jogulu, U., Lundy, J., & Taylor, H. (2024). Will return-to-office mandates prevent proximity bias for employees working from home? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 83, 717–722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12634>
47. Wu, Y. J., Antone, B., DeChurch, L., & Contractor, N. (2023). Information sharing in a hybrid workplace: Understanding the role of ease-of-use perceptions of communication technologies in advice-seeking relationship maintenance. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 28(4), zmad025. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmad025>